indices, that is, Consumer Price Indices for Agricultural Labourers (CPIAL) for rural areas and Consumer Price Indices for Industrial workers(CPIIW) for urban areas.

(b) The Planning Commission estimates the incidence of poverty at national and state level, separately in rural and urban areas of the country. However, the State Governments, in association with the Ministry of Rural Development, are responsible for determining the BPL status and identifying the poor families in rural areas for the purpose of selection of beneficiary families under anti-poverty programmes.

(c) The estimation of poverty incidence in the country and the identification of individual BPL households are separate and distinct exercises. It may not be possible or even desirable to use a uniform criterion for both. The Expert Group on Identification of Households Below Poverty line (2002) set up by the Ministry of Rural Development explicitly recommended against the use of the poverty line as a criteron for BPL identification.

Cost overrun in pending Government projects

*25. SHRI RAVULA CHANDRA SEKAR REDDY: Will the Minister of STATISTICS AND PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION be pleased to state:

(a) whether there has been a cost overrun of more than 10 per cent in 315 pending Government projects, costing over Rs. 100 crore each;

(b) if so, the details thereof and the reasons for not completing projects in the estimated time, State-wise;

(c) whether his Ministry is monitoring the projects to ensure their smooth completion; and

(d) if so, the details thereof?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF STATISTICS AND PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION (SHRI G.K. VASAN): (a) and (b) Yes, Sir. As on 1.10.2004, there were 315 central projects each costing more than Rs. 100 crore, that had cost overruns of about 10%. However, as on 1.7.2006, there were 159 delayed projects each costing Rs. 100 crore and above. Projects get delayed in implementation on account of various reasons such as (1) delay in acquisition of land, (2) delay in

finalizing the scope of the project, (3) non-tying up of funds, (4) delay in delivery of equipment and (5) slow pace of work. A Statement showing the number of delayed projects, state-wise, with time overrun is annexed (*See* below).

(c) and (d) Yes, Sir. The steps taken to ensure timely completion of these projects are as follows:

(i) adoption of two-stage clearance system and stricter appraisal of projects before investment approval;

(ii) taking up of projects for implementation only after funds have been fully tied up;

(iii) in-depth review of projects on monthly and quarterly basis by the Government;

(iv) setting up of an Empowered Committee in the administrative Ministries for review of departmentally executed projects;

(v) inter-ministerial coordination for resolving unresolved problems; and

(vi) appointment of nodal officers for each project with continuity of tenure.

Statement

State-wise summary of delayed projects costing Rs. 100 crore and above as on 01/07/2006

(Cost/Expenditure is in Rs. crore)

Sl. No.	State/UT	No. of Projects	Original Cost	Anticipated Cost	Cumulative Expenditure	Delay Range in months
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	Andhra Pradesh	6	3046.54	3627.91	1159.41	2-37
2	Arunachal Pradesh	1	2496.90	2496.90	392.01	20
3	Assam	4	1874.76	3168.26	601.65	3-36
4	Bihar	15	16249.76	16318.90	2068.28	1-41
5	Gujarat	10	3979.54	4666.11	1186.84	13-38
6	Haryana	3	7778.00	9184.00	6775.20	11-18
7	Himachal Pradesh	1	2304.56	2304.56	90.81	1

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	J & K	4	2903.02	14047.22	8135.20	21-192
9	Karnataka	8	2052.45	1938.99	1602.81	18-35
10	Kerala	2	559.85	559.85	47.63	10-18
11	Madhya Pradesh	5	929.83	1036.56	211.26	3-132
12	Maharashtra	12	6022.63	8311.33	1923.72	2-93
13	Meghalaya	1	71.18	422.60	260.63	93
14	Mizoram	1	368.72	686.95	236.04	32
15	Orissa	9	1824.55	1843.84	1125.74	4-81
16	Punjab	1	508.63	508.63	171.34	18
17	Rajasthan	4	1391.91	1391.91	221.36	1-18
18	Tamil Nadu	7	3683.67	3811.36	1144.94	2-57
19	Uttar Pradesh	19	5495.59	5740.77	3222.39	1-95
20	West Bengal	7	3683.02	3683.02	1975.33	6-35
21	Delhi	3	5367.39	10970.46	10450.54	17-27
22	Chhattisgarh	3	553.47	553.47	235.02	4-11
23	Jharkhand	5	1258.46	1241.19	796.38	3-156
24	Uttaranchal	5	4750.97	8460.19	8168.42	3.91
25	Multistate	23	18880.39	22582.12	15914.63	1-159
	TOTAL :	159	98035.79	129567.1	68117.58	

Indians in Pakistani Jails

†*26. DR. PRABHA THAKUR:
SHRI JAI PARKASH AGGARWAL:

Will the Minister of EXTERNAL AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether a number of Indians are detained in Pakistani jails, if so, the reasons for keeping them in prisons;

(b) the approximate number thereof and since how many years they are imprisoned; and

(c) whether Government have taken any action to get these prisoners released and if so, the results thereof and if not, the reasons therefor?

†Original notice of the question was received in Hindi.